



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Some months ago Dr. R. F. WEYMOUTH reprinted from the 'Theological Monthly' for July and Sept., 1890, a paper *On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect*, being really a counterblast against the havoc which the Revisers have made of the natural feeling of English by trying to render with distressing uniformity the Greek aorist by the English preterite—which was not an aorist, to begin with. It is pleasant to learn from a circular recently received that the light has been welcomed where such light is needed, although it seems rather strange that scholars require to be told that the historical tenses shift from language to language and will not bear mechanical transfer. However, the readers of this Journal, among whom Dr. WEYMOUTH cannot be counted, will remember that Professor Whitney thought it worth his while to enlarge on this subject in a review of Delbrück's *Vedic Syntax* (A. J. P. XIII 289 foll.), and Dr. Weymouth's illustrations from modern languages will be found interesting. The natural affinity of the aor. for the negative is an old story and has been taken for granted these many years. Hence the shift from perf. to aor. and aor. to perf., which, to be sure, escaped the acumen of Madvig (§112, R. 1). It has long been maintained that 'when the perf. is used as a pres., the aor. is used as a perfect' (A. J. P. IV 429), and this formula has received the approval of Mr. Monro in his *Homeric Grammar*², p. 67. Nor will it be news to some of us that the Greek perfect differs from the English perfect in that it can be used 'when the further end is dated,' as I have expressed it in my *Justin Mart. Apol.* I 33, 17. Cf. also II 2, 17 and *Isai.* 3, 7; *Dem.* 21, 7; 38, 8, though in these classical examples the position of *τότε* is to be noted. But the most surprising thing in the pamphlet is the statement that the translation of the Greek present, as in *ιστορῶ πάλαι*, by the English progressive perfect 'has escaped observation.' I can only vouch for the fact that it has been a commonplace of elementary instruction in America for fifty years. From these specimens of the most salient features of Dr. WEYMOUTH's pamphlet, it will hardly be thought necessary to go into further detail, although his statistics might have compelled the attention of syntacticians, if they were not of the eclectic order. Still, it may be worth while to reproduce one set which is based on 'many chapters' of Thucydides and Herodotus (p. 13):

	Pres.	His. Pres.	Impf.	Aor.	Perf.	Plpf.	Fut.
Narrative:							
Thuc.	5	9	45	34	1	4	2
Herod.	21	1.5	34	32.5	2	1.5	7.5
Non-narrative:							
Thuc.	55	0	8	13	6	0	18
Herod.	55	0	4	19	7	1	14

Unsatisfactory as the basis is, the table will not be without interest as compared with other studies in the proportion of aorist and imperfect (see A. J. P. IV 163, XIV 105, and Dr. Miller's article in the current number); and the small average of the hist. pres. in Herodotus as compared with Thukydides might tempt one to comment on the epic cast of Herodotus' narrative, if one were not afraid of too rapid an induction. Rodemeyer, who has given us a misty and elusive theory of the historical present, has not condescended to give figures, which would be very welcome here.

In his *Vera Historia* Lucian reports a conversation with Homer in which the poet declares that his obelized verses are all his—a joke, which has its serious side, for it has not unfrequently happened that the most interesting works current under an author's name are precisely those that the critics have fallen foul of. And certainly nothing that Philo has written seems to have attracted more popular attention than his description of the Therapeutai in the *de vita contemplativa*, which, of late years, has been relegated to the limbo of forgeries. This is the tract which Eusebius cites to prove the existence of Christian monastic orders in the first century, and to this citation is probably due the importance attached to Philo in the Christian church. Indeed Mr. CONYBEARE, in his learned and interesting edition of *Philo, About the Contemplative Life* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan), goes so far as to suggest that the preservation of Philo's works is a distinct result of this fancy of the Bishop of Caesarea, a fancy which Scaliger calls *tam crassus, tam anilis error*. 'If he had not originated and given vogue to his absurd hypothesis,' says Mr. CONYBEARE, 'the works of Philo might never have been transmitted to us.' That the hypothesis is absurd Mr. CONYBEARE undertakes to show in his *Excursus* on the Authorship, and in so doing he has met and seemingly annihilated the contention of Lucius, who maintains that the work is a Christian forgery intended to bolster monastic institutions. This theory, started in 1880, has been accepted, apparently without any close scrutiny, by a number of leading authorities, and Mr. CONYBEARE has wrought at the problem with a thoroughness that will command respectful attention. The internal evidence from the language as compared with Philo's genuine writings is brought out with the most painstaking exhaustiveness, and though scholars have been found to dispute the genuineness of certain works of the Lucianic corpus on the ground of the slavishness of the imitation, such an argument would hardly apply here. The coincidences are, so to speak, too organic. A fragment of an Old Latin Version and an Armenian Version have been reproduced in this edition for the purpose of establishing the text, and the rich commentary justifies the editor's claim to have explored for himself the literary horizon of the times. True, one misses here and there the classical passages, and it seems a little odd to be referred to Plutarch, de Iside, for the combination *ποιεῖται καὶ λογογράφου*, without a mention of the source in Thuk. I, 21, and it is to be hoped that

Xenodotus for Zenodotus, the Homeric scholar, is an error of the types. A similar error escaped the eye of Krüger in an early edition of the *Anabasis*, where one reads now ΖΕΝΟΦΩΝ, now ΣΕΝΟΦΩΝ, and this Journal is almost always in mourning for typographical sins.

The thesis maintained by Dr. VERRALL in his *Euripides, the Rationalist* (Macmillan) is not merely that Euripides was a rationalist, but that he was a *consistent* rationalist, and not only made use of his characters to discredit the established order of religion, but contrived the plots of his plays so as to bring contempt upon such articles of faith as the resurrection from the dead, the being and attributes of Apollo, and the veracity of the Delphic oracle. Such plays as the *Alkestis*, the *Ion*, the *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* are deliberate mystifications, and the study of Euripides is 'confusion, vexation, waste of spirits and time,' unless one takes the right point of view and stands where one can catch the wink which Euripides tips to the sympathetic unbelievers. Needless to say, the theory is advocated with great ingenuity and unflagging liveliness of style. That Dr. Verrall will carry the world with him to the extent to which he has pushed the accepted doctrine of Euripides' unbelief is doubtful. The perpetual vigilance necessary for following the mocking poet and his agile interpreter will hardly be compensated by the gain of a consistent Euripides. One of the crimes of the old *Collectanea Graeca Minora*—still a textbook in my boyhood—was the early introduction of the student of Greek to Palaephatus, and yet another contemner of the gods whom the pawky Scotch editor brought in to prevent ingenuous youth from worshipping the heathen deities was Lucian. Now if Palaephatus and Lucian—the one with his drybones rationalism, the other with his hollow merriment—are to be our guides to the understanding of Euripides, the older generation of scholars will refuse to join in the quest, and leave investigators of a more modern breed to nose out further impieties in a poet who is first a poet and then, if you choose, a mystifier, and not the other way.

αιγίλιψ is still a puzzle. It occurs I 15 = II 4 ὥστε κρήνη μελάνυδρος | ἥ τε κατ' αιγίλιπος πέτρης δνοφερὸν χέει ὕδωρ. Then N 63 ὥστ' ἱρήξ ὠκύπτερος ὄρτο πέτεσθαι | ὅς ῥά τ' ἀπ' αιγίλιπος πέτρης περιμήκεος ἄρθεῖς κτέ. Instead of going through the list of experiments, I will cite Platt's note on I 15: 'Goebel [Lex. I 18] derives [*αιγίλιπος*] from *αιγίς* and *λιπ-* of *λε-λιμ-μένος* [*λιψουρία*], etc., to love, explaining "the haunt of storms." This may perhaps be accepted for want of a better. The old explanation was "so steep as to be deserted even by the goats!"' And this old explanation is the explanation still given by PRELLWITZ, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht), a book which has been awaiting its reviewer in this Journal for many moons.

Yet another way is suggested by a passage in a recent work. W. M. Conway, in his *Climbing in the Himalayas*, says (p. 536): 'We ultimately encamped on the glacier near the foot of one of its buttresses, on whose ledges was a little grass. The goats that had been driven up to Footstool Camp were able to feed on this [grass], and had their first good meal for several days, so we named the camp *Goats' Delight*.' This αἰγῶνις πέτρη was 15,090 feet high—much higher than is necessary—but one-half tradition, one-half Goebel, would seem to give a very fair sense. Calf Pasture and Cow Pasture are familiar geographical designations in America, and a Goat Pasture Rock gives a very good picture. The rock of wild goats is quite as suitable as the 'wild goats of the rock' (Job 39, 1), and every one knows that the high hills are a refuge for the goats (Ps. 104, 18).

The translation of *Gilbert's Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens* by Messrs. BROOKS and NICKLIN (Macmillan & Co.) will be of service to the ever-lessening number of classical scholars who have not a familiar command of German. The scientific value of the work is pretty much limited to the references supplied by Dr. SANDYS to the introductory chapter on *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*. To the same sphere of study belongs the first instalment of SUSEMIHL AND HICKS'S *Politics of Aristotle* (Macmillan & Co.). The text has been revised by SUSEMIHL and brought into agreement with his late edition (Teubner, 1894). The changes in the notes have been comprehensive and the English collaborator has added a great deal of valuable matter. One reads, however, with dismay that pp. 1-460 had been printed off before the appearance of Mr. Newman's elaborate commentary on the *Politics*, published in 1887, and that these pages had been held back until the whole instalment (689 pp.) was ready. The German *Heft* and *Abteilung* system has its disadvantages, which are keenly felt by scholars of other nationalities, but when one considers the great costliness of English books, it is hard to suppress a sense of impatience at the late issue of a work which, according to modern notions, is half-antiquated at its birth.

I should say that Mr. BLAKE, in his school edition of the *First Two Books of the Hellenica of Xenophon* (Boston, Allyn and Bacon), has taken his task more seriously than the average editor, and I should add that in particular he has shown a praiseworthy disposition to go outside of the ordinary observations of the standard grammars, if in doing so he had not drawn largely on this Journal, so that any word of commendation on my part might seem to be a needless illustration of a vicious circle that has been zealously trodden ever since the beginning of society. I will, however, allow myself to say that many years ago I selected these same two books as a harmless field for syntactical analysis. They are not so interesting as to make the constant intrusion of grammar unbearable, nor yet are they

arid or uninformative from other points of view. On comparing my MS work with Mr. BLAKE'S book I find that he has omitted a good many things that I should have noticed, but that is a matter of judgment. The worst typographical error noticed is the misspelling of *Θηραμένης* (pp. 96 and 159). The text of the *Hellenica* is followed by selections from *Lysias c. Erastostenem* (6-20, 62-78) and from *Aristotle's Πολ.* 'Ath., cc. XXXIV-XL, a welcome addition to the students of that period of Attic history.

Professor FRIEDRICH HANSSEN, of Santiago, has turned his attention from classical philology to Old Spanish, and those who have followed his work in his original domain will look forward to interesting developments in his new field of activity. He has been put in charge of the instruction in the historical grammar of Spanish, in the Instituto Pedagógico—a special honor for a foreigner in a Spanish-speaking country—and one of the first fruits of his studies has already appeared in an elaborate paper, *Sobre la conjugacion de Gonzalo de Berceo*, published in the *Anales de la Universidad*, Santiago de Chile, 1895.

Professor JOSEPH WRIGHT, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford, has issued a prospectus of *The English Dialect Dictionary, being the Complete Vocabulary of all Dialect Words still in use or known to have been in use during the last Two Hundred Years; founded mainly on the Publications of the English Dialect Society and a large amount of material never before printed*. The Dictionary is to be brought out by annual subscription, a guinea a year, in return for which subscribers will receive two half-yearly parts, each published at 15s. to non-subscribers. The minimum number of subscribers required by the editor to begin the work is *one thousand*, and unless this number is forthcoming the whole scheme of editing the Dictionary will have to be definitely abandoned. Address Professor Joseph Wright, 6 Norham Road, Oxford. No undertaking could appeal more powerfully to American students of English or to American literary men. In our heart of hearts we are all delighted to find warrant for our own naughtinesses and provincialisms in nooks and corners of the old home.